9044

THE Monthly Reviewers Reviewed,

IN

A LETTER TO THOSE GENTLEMEN,

POINTING OUT THEIR

MISREPRESENTATIONS AND FALLACIOUS REASONINGS

IN THEIR

ACCOUNT OF A PAMPHLET

ENTITLED

DISPERSION OF THE GLOOMY APPREHENSIONS DEDUCED FROM THE DECLINE OF OUR CORN-TRADE, &c.

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL ILLLUSTRATIONS

OF SOME OF THE

PRINCIPAL POSITIONS CONTAINED IN THAT PAMPHLET.

BY THE REV. J. HOWLETT,

VICAR OF GREAT DUNMOW, ESSEX.

An si quis atro dente me petiverit,
Inultus ut flebo puer? HOR.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR W. J. AND J. RICHARDSON, UNDER THE ROYAL EXCHANGE.

1798.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE

MONTHLY REVIEWERS.

GENTLEMEN,

I HAVE read, in the correſpondence of your Review for January, 1798, your acknowledgement of the receipt of my letter, reſpecting your ſtrictures on my pamphlet, entitled *Diſperſion of the gloomy Apprehenſions, &c. deduced from the Decline of our Corn-Trade, &c.* and, had these acknowledgements contained a manly explicit retraction of thoſe *few* and *inferior* miſrepreſentations which I had noticed, I ſhould have deſiſted from farther animadverſion. You have, indeed, aſſumed the appearance of candid conceſſion, but it is ſo vague and evaſive, and accompanied with ſuch frivolous attempts at palliation of what you had advanced, that it ſtill remains incumbent upon me to vindicate myſelf againſt your more numerous and more malevolent aſperſions. You have not only attacked my reputation as a writer, but my moral character as a man. You have charged me with *quoting falſely*, for the ſupport of error, on a ſubject of high importance, and have conſidered this as of nearly a

the ſame culpability, whether done from negligence or deſign. How ſuch conduct, if proved againſt me, could be conſiſtent with ſtrict morality, is beyond my narrow conception. To juſtify myſelf under this accuſation it is hoped will be admitted as an excuſe for requeſting the public attention to what, by the generality of readers, it is feared, will be deemed extremely unintereſting. *A ſolicitude for my reputation as a writer*; — your own ſenſibility on this point will, it is preſumed, readily ſuggeſt an apology for. Your anxiety to preſerve your literary eminence muſt have been *all over tremblingly alive*, or you would never have written more than *twelve* elaborate pages in the Review of a pamphlet, of which a full and ſatisfactory account might have been given in *one*.* An additional plea in my favour is, that we are naturally moſt eager to preſerve a poſſeſſion which, we are *conſcious*, is but ſmall. *My* literary diſtinction is trifling; and it is ſurely pardonable if I appear zealous to retain it entire. But *you*, Gentlemen, poſſeſſed of it, according to your own perſuaſion, in the utmoſt plenitude, need not be concerned that any one has ſucceſsfully attempted, and ſtill continues to attempt, to make a little *deduction* from it; much leſs ought you to cheriſh ſo cruel a reſentment as to endeavour to rob him of his *mite*.

Without farther introduction, I proceed to examine your ſtrictures, and to point out the fallacious reaſonings and repeated miſrepreſentations by which you have en-

* The Britiſh Critic has given a clear and judicious analyſis of my whole pamphlet in little more than two pages. He has treated me with fairneſs and candour, which is all I ever deſire.

deavoured

deavoured to ſupport them. In doing this, I ſhall adopt ſerious argument where your remarks appear in the leaſt to deſerve it; and, where they do not, I hope to be pardoned, if, in humble imitation of your own example, and a little to enliven the dulneſs of dry diſcuſſion, I indulge in ſallies of humorous pleaſantry.

Upon your introductory paragraphs I make no particular remarks, but leave it to the candid reader to decide whether they be not mere frivolous parade, or hypocritical farce, in order to gain credit, and add poignancy to the malevolent criticiſms intended to follow.

In page 400, you aſſert, that I have not even *attempted* to account for the increaſed importation of grain into this kingdom, independent of political cauſes; and then, in the very ſame paragraph, you ſay I *have* attempted it, by aſcribing it *principally* to the increaſed population of this country. This *manifeſt inconſiſtency*, though much greater than any thing of the kind you have diſcovered in my pamphlet, notwithſtanding your repeated charges of it, I conſider as a circumſtance too trifling to dwell upon, and, therefore, ſhall proceed immediately to the conſideration of matters of greater importance.

That *I have attempted* to account for the fact in queſtion, independent of the corn-laws or any other political cauſe whatever, is certain; and, it is equally certain, at leaſt in my own conception, and in that of many perſons of very reſpectable judgement, that I have *ſucceeded* in the *attempt*; but that I have aſcribed it *principally* to our increaſed population is a downright *falſehood*. Increaſed population, indeed, I have

conſidered as one cauſe; and who, that opens his eyes, can doubt it? But the great and *principal* cauſes, by me pointed out, are our *increaſed luxury*, our *increaſed number of hogs, ſheep, and oxen*, and, above all, our increaſed *number of horſes*, which, on the authority of Mr. Mackie, I have ſtated to be 400,000, and which I have expreſſly ſaid, page 16, are the *greateſt conſumers* of all; and I have alſo evinced that they alone require prodigiouſly more for their ſupport than the whole of our increaſed imports added to the whole of our diminiſhed exports, due regard being had to the quantity of land neceſſary to be appropriated to their uſe in the production of graſs, hay, and corn. After this, Gentlemen, where was your imagined quick diſcernment, where was your regard for truth, where your often affected candour, when you told the public that I had aſcribed them *principally* to our increaſed population?

The falſe aſſertions in this paragraph being thus detected, I proceed to page 401, where you inform your readers, that I have *aſſerted*, page 33 of my pamphlet, that the natural variation between one ſeaſon and another ſometimes diminiſhes the crop at the rate of *twelve buſhels* an acre over the whole crop!!!

In page 33, there is not a ſyllable ſaid upon the ſubject, (a circumſtance marking your culpable inattention,) nor, as far as I know, is there ſuch an aſſertion in my whole pamphlet. I have, indeed, intimated, in page 51, that it is eaſy to *conceive* ſuch a difference of ſeaſons to happen as to cauſe a deficiency of 12 buſhels an acre inſtead of 6, to which I have aſcribed the late ſcarcity.

Now,

Now, here are ſeveral miſconceptions. In the firſt place, my intimation did not extend to the *whole crop*, but merely to *wheat*; a diſtinction highly important. There may be a deficiency in *one* ſpecies of corn, and yet the abundance in *others* may afford ample compenſation. The ſame ſeaſon ſeldom ſuits all kinds of grain. Not ſeven years ago the crop of peaſe fell ſhort of the average-produce not only 12 buſhels, but, I believe, more than 15. Nay, a vaſt proportion of them was entirely deſtroyed; and, what enhanced the calamity, it happened, when the ſtems were advanced nearly to their full growth, their bloſſoms were opening, and the proſpect of a copious return was highly flattering; but they were, in a manner, inſtantaneouſly attacked by an army of inſects. In a few days the deſtruction was complete, and the blighted ſtems were mown as fodder for the cattle, to which they proved extremely pernicious. The plenty, however, of ſome other productions was nearly a counter-balance.

In the year 1796, though the crop of wheat was conſiderably defective, that of other grain was ſo abundant as to make full amends; and there is not a ſhadow of doubt, but that, if the recommendation of Parliament, and the example of the firſt characters in the kingdom, had that year been followed, wheat would have borne a moderate price.

It is farther to be remarked, that I made no poſitive *aſſertion* that ſuch an event actually does take place even with reſpect to *wheat*; that it has taken place ſince the commencement of the preſent century; or is likely to take place within the compaſs of any definite

nite future period; but I merely intimated the *poſſibility* of ſuch an occurrence: and who, that admits the ſuperintendence of a Divine Providence, will venture to deny this? — But I am not ſolicitous to avail myſelf of this diſtinction, though extremely important: — I will ſuppoſe, that I had made the direct aſſertion with which I am falſely charged, and I am hardy enough to venture upon its defence, againſt all the ſophiſtry with which you can attack it.

You ſeem to think, that, in the preſent high ſtate of cultivation, no great ſcarcity is ever to be apprehended; and thus much is readily acknowledged, that it is leſs probable than formerly, when our lands were, at beſt, very imperfectly tilled, — the heavy and wet ſoils were greatly impaired and rendered unfertile for want of timely drainage, — and when manure alſo was much leſs plentiful and various than at preſent. — But, even now, with all our ſuperior ſkill and more ſpirited exertions, we are far from confident ſecurity. Do not the rains, the winds, and the froſts, ſtand ready to execute the orders of Omnipotence? and are not a few weeks, or even a few days, continuance of any one of theſe, longer than uſual, at certain critical periods, ſufficient to defeat our moſt ſkilful efforts, and blaſt our moſt flattering proſpects? — Is this at all more unlikely to happen in England than in Scotland, whoſe agriculture you ſeem to think has got the ſtart of ours? But, did not this actually take place there in the year 1782? nay, did it not occur even in *Aberdeenſhire*, one of the moſt highly-cultivated counties in the kingdom, reducing it, by a ſingle failure, to an

almoſt

almoſt abſolute famine? —— Dr. J. Anderſon aſſures us, that oatmeal (an article as much *their* ſtaff of life as wheat is *ours)* was then defective *four-fifths of its average-quantity.* What is a deficiency of only twelve buſhels of wheat an acre (the utmoſt of my hypothetical ſuppoſition) comparable to this? and which, notwithſtanding, you have been pleaſed to treat with evident marks of ſarcaſtic contempt; how juſtly, I now leave the candid reader to judge.

In the third paragraph, page 403, you have loaded me with the heavy charge of *quoting falſely.* You ſay, "that, with a precipitancy which, in the inveſtigation "of an important queſtion, requires the ſevereſt cen- "ſure, I have gone ſo far as to *quote falſely:* whether "through careleſſneſs or deſign is needleſs to inquire; "in a caſe of this nature they are nearly alike blame- "able." In this maxim, I have no reluctance to acquieſce, the *blameableneſs* and the *ſeverity of cenſure* falling *lightly* upon *me*, but very *heavily* upon *you. My* quotation is correct, to the third part of a quarter; and the uſe I have made of it is in the direct line of my argument: — your's is *erroneous*, as far as the only point in queſtion is concerned, in the proportion of almoſt twenty to one: — and, what is a peculiar aggravation of your conduct, you appear to have given your erroneous ſtatement with the manifeſt intention to injure the credit and character of a perſon who had done nothing juſtly to offend you, but, on the contrary, had treated you with a candour and fairneſs which you ſeem zealous to convince the public you do not deſerve. He had beſtowed the juſt tribute of

commendation upon the many excellent criticiſms which have occaſionally appeared in your work, and returned his acknowledgements for the variety of inſtruction he had thence received; obſerving, however, at the ſame time, that it had often been remarked, by *others*, that ſometimes no judgement could be formed of a work from your account of it. Both theſe ſentiments I now repeat; and I declare the latter, no leſs than the former, to be my own idea, confident of being able to eſtabliſh the truth and juſtneſs of it. In a word, I had merely denied your *infallibility*; which, before I have done, will appear, I preſume, to be as feeble and tottering as that of his Holineſs at Rome.

I have ſaid, (page 11 of my pamphlet,) that the annual exceſs of importation over exportation, according to Mr. Mackie's Tables, was, during the nine years ending with 1798, only 36,893 quarters. If you will pleaſe to turn to my authority, you will find, that Mr. Mackie, in his firſt Letter to the Editor of Mr. Dirom's Inquiry into the Corn-Laws, &c. page 199, ſtates, that the exceſs, per annum, of the importation of foreign *wheat*, (the only grain my argument was concerned in,) was 36,893$\frac{1}{3}$ quarters; that is, not three buſhels more than I had ſtated it at; a quantity omitted by me as too inconſiderable for notice. If you are of a different opinion, I readily make you a preſent of it, with my full permiſſion to uſe it as your uncommon ſagacity may ſuggeſt.

In your acknowledgement of my letter, page 119 of your Review for January, 1798, before referred to, you ſay, that, on re-peruſing the paſſages now under conſideration,

conſideration, you find they *will* bear the conſtruction I have put upon them, namely, that I was there ſpeaking of *wheat*, and of no other grain whatever. Permit me to obſerve, that they not only *will* bear that conſtruction, but that they *can* bear no other. Your reference to the top of page 10, in vindication of the meaning you had moſt unaccountably thought proper to put upon them, only makes a bad matter worſe. Like men ſtruggling in a quagmire, at every plunge you ſink deeper and deeper in the mud.

At the top of the page referred to, I obſerved, that, having in ſome meaſure diſperſed the gloomy concluſions deduced from the decline of our corn-trade, I might cheerfully proceed to examine the maxim, *that the change in our corn-laws has been the cauſe of the rapid decline of our exportation of grain.*

For this purpoſe, I immediately remark that there is no neceſſity to ſuppoſe that this change has been any cauſe at all, and for this plain and obvious reaſon, *that there were other cauſes in abundance, of certain and indubitable operation, ſufficient to account for it, without allowing to theſe laws the ſmalleſt influence whatever.*

One of theſe cauſes I directly ſubjoin, and that a *leading* one, (not in ſize and conſequence, as evidently appears ſome pages after, but in the natural order of things,) was " the vaſt increaſe of our *population*, and, " of courſe, a proportionably increaſed *conſumption.*" — Conſumption of what? — Surely, of that grain uſually converted into food for *Engliſh men and women*; and what is that but *wheat?* — But, to remove all poſſibility of doubt from minds of the ſmalleſt degree of attention,

attention, *wheat* is immediately ſpecified, nor is any other grain even alluded to, as part of my *then* argument, till page 15. If even *this* had not been ſufficient to convince you of the only intended meaning, the very firſt ſtatement of figures, in page 11, ought to have done it. I have there ſtated, that the annual exceſs of exportation, during the ten *favourite* years, beginning with 1741, and ending with 1750, was about 371,925* quarters, which, though not perfectly correct, was enough ſo for the purpoſe. A moment's examination of the tables, from which this was extracted, muſt have ſhewn you that nothing could be intended but *wheat*; for, had it been *all* kinds of grain, it would have been *double* that amount, and, during the three laſt years of the ſpecified period, more than *three times*. But, if even this did not open your eyes, it is really amazing that the average-exceſs of importation over exportation, during the nine years ending with 1793, ſtated at 39,893 quarters, did not accompliſh it. When you ſaw, or *ought* to have ſeen, that this was actually given by Mr. Mackie as the number of quarters of *wheat* only, and that the exceſs of the importation of *all kinds* of grain, given by me from the ſame tables, page 19, and for the ſame nine years, amounted to 564,185† quarters, it is truly aſtoniſhing, it is indeed almoſt impoſſible, you ſhould have *miſtaken* my meaning. The conſequence I leave to yourſelves to ſettle; and I ap-

* More correctly 379,682 3-10ths.

† I quoted with implicit confidence in the correctneſs of Mr. Mackie; but, upon conſulting his Abſtract Table, page 201, more minutely, I think it ſhould have been 575,296 quarters. But this alters not the argument.

peal

peal to the candour of my readers to determine whether you have not herein diſplayed a marvellous propenſity to *diſcover* my errors, and a firm reſolution, if they could not be *found*, to *make* them for me.

In page 411, you obſerve, " that ſeveral paſſages in " my pamphlet ſtrongly indicate *the cauſe* of *that bias* " which has perverted my judgement." I wiſh you had been kind enough to have pointed out what that *cauſe* or that *bias* was, that I might have endeavoured to guard againſt it for the future. You will, I hope, pardon me if, in my turn, I conjecture that you alſo have been under *a bias*, which has led you into otherwiſe unaccountable miſtakes; and I will be ſo ingenuous as to mention what I ſuppoſe that bias to be: — it is no other than thoſe powerful prepoſſeſſions of education which few are able to reſiſt. In a word, I ſtrongly ſuſpect that you were brought up at the feet of that *modern Gamaliel*, *the celebrated Philoſopher of Fernay*, and that you are ambitious of rivalling your great maſter. *He*, upon reading a chapter in the Prophet Ezekiel, diſcovered, that the JEWS were *cannibals*; that they not merely killed and ate their priſoners of war, but fed upon the *dead* bodies and *putrid* carcaſes of thoſe who fell on the field of battle. But, upon conſulting the ſacred writer himſelf, we find that here is *a trifling miſapprehenſion*; that it was not the *Jews* who fed after this foul and ſavage mode, but the voracious *birds* and *beaſts* of prey, whom the Prophet, on the authority of the Almighty, calls upon, in his uſual bold ſublimity of language, to aſſemble together, and partake of the ſacrifice which God was about to

make

make upon the mountains of Iſrael. " To every fea-
" thered fowl, and every beaſt of the field, he ſaid, —
" aſſemble yourſelves, and come, and ye ſhall *eat the*
" *fleſh of the mighty, and drink the blood of princes.*" —
You, in like manner, if I may be allowed to compare ſmall things with great, having peruſed my pamphlet with ſimilar attention and no leſs friendly deſign than Voltaire read the Bible, have virtually told the public that I repreſent the inhabitants of England as living on the ſame food as the *brutes*, though I had clearly and fully expreſſed the contrary. — Worthy pupils of a worthy maſter!

However, after all, to accommodate you as well as I can, Gentlemen, I will now ſuppoſe, that I had imagined Engliſh men and women lived upon all kinds of grain, promiſcuouſly, like other animals, and that our increaſed population might be conſidered as a principal cauſe of our increaſed imports, added to our diminiſhed exports. I will now venture to aſſert, that, every other circumſtance continuing the ſame, there would not merely have been no abſurdity in the aſſertion, but that this increaſed population would alone have accounted for *double* the aggregate amount of our increaſed imports and our diminiſhed exports. I have ſtated the augmentation of the inhabitants of Great Britain, ſince the year 1750, to have been about two millions and a half; and, as they are now admitted to live upon all ſorts of grain, we cannot allow them leſs than two millions and a half quarters for their annual conſumption; but I find the annual average-exceſs of exportation over importation, during the ten years beginning

ginning with 1741, added to the excefs of importation over exportation, during the nine years ending with 1793, was only 954,978$\frac{3}{10}$ quarters, which is not half the increafed conſumption by human creatures alone; and, when we add to this the conſideration of our increafed *luxury*, our *increaſed number of hogs, ſheep*, and *oxen*, our prodigiouſly *increaſed number of horſes*, our immenſe conſumption of grain by our increafed diſtilleries, I muſt again repeat, that it is really aſtoniſhing that our importations have not been vaſtly greater, and that the proof hence ariſing of our greatly improved and extended agriculture, to ſay the leaſt of it, is highly probable.

But you obſerve, (page 400,) "allowing the full "amount of the increafed population for which I con- "tend, and alſo that this operated preciſely in the man- "ner in which I ſtate it, the difficulty is by no means "removed; for, in that caſe, (purſuing my own mode "of reaſoning,) it muſt be evident, from the tables "above-mentioned, that the population of this coun- "try muſt have been gradually *de*creaſing till the year "1750." This, at firſt ſight, has a plauſible appearance; but I am ſtrangely miſtaken if you have not here inverted the courſe of my argument, and taught it to move backwards. Had I ſaid, that a gradually-increaſing importation implied a gradually-increaſing population, your concluſion would have been juſt, that a gradually-*increaſing exportation*, all other circumſtances remaining the ſame, muſt as certainly imply a *de*creaſing number of people. But I have ſaid no ſuch thing: I have only obſerved, that an increafed

population;

population; an *increaſed luxury*; an *increaſed number of hogs, ſheep*, and *oxen*; above all, an enormouſly *increaſed number of horſes*; have jointly occaſioned ſo great an increaſed conſumption, as alone to account for vaſtly more than our increaſed importations, added to our diminiſhed exportations. This argument, according to my conceptions, is clear, direct, and concluſive; and I may, I think, defy you, or any body elſe, to prove the contrary. The converſe of the reaſoning is not *my* concern.

In page 403, paragraph 2, you obſerve, that, with an "inconſiſtency which too ſtrongly characterizes the "whole of my pamphlet, I had no ſooner advanced "the plauſible argument, that the rents might be admitted as a preſumptive proof of our great improvements in agriculture, than I make haſte, in the very "next ſentence, to refute my own aſſertion; for, that, "after having aſſerted, page 7, that the farmers, before the year 1750, were conſtantly going backwards, "and, ſince that period, have been as perpetually riſing, faſter and faſter, into wealth and affluence, and "that neither is to be wondered at, the average-price "of wheat being only 32*s.* per quarter, in the firſt "period, and all kinds of grain and every agricultural "produce proportionably cheap, but, in the ſecond, that "wheat had been almoſt 50*s.* per quarter, other grains "equally dear, butter, cheeſe, oxen, ſheep, hogs, dearer ſtill, I aſk, has the advance of rents, rates, tithes, "taxes, &c. been equivalent? — This queſtion I anſwered in the negative." And this queſtion I anſwer in the negative ſtill; and I appeal to the ſame evidence

evidence of it, — the increaſed proſperity of our farmers; and I appeal, likewiſe, to all of competent judgement whether the argument be not direct and concluſive.

" But you ſay, that it hence follows that the riſe " of rents, which I ſo exultingly hold up as a proof " of the rapid advance of improvement, is, by my own " mode of reaſoning, no proof of it at all; ſeeing, that " though the improvements had been entirely ſtation- " ary, and though no alteration had taken place in the " mode of management, the riſe of rents, by my own " account, ought to have been greater than it actually " has been."

By blending together two diſtinct arguments, and for two diſtinct purpoſes, you have here produced, I readily acknowledge, a plauſible appearance of inconſiſtency. The firſt argument is urged merely as a *preſumptive* evidence of an improved agriculture; the ſecond as a proof of the increaſed proſperity of our farmers. Both, as far as they go, are direct to their reſpective points, and no candid critic would have conſidered them otherwiſe; and, as the main objects of each are clear and fully eſtabliſhed in other parts of my pamphlet, I need not trouble myſelf to remove any trifling appearance of inconſiſtency ariſing from incidental ſtatements of different arguments, one of which was urged *en paſſant*, and merely as *preſumptive*, and which, if thrown entirely out of the queſtion, the grand purpoſe would remain uninjured.

In page 404, paragraph 3, you enter, with much ſolemnity, upon arguments wonderfully profound, and endeavour

deavour to confirm them by illuſtrations of ſingular ingenuity. That the reader may not loſe a particle of theſe precious morſels, I will here give them in their full dimenſions.

Continuing to ſpeak of the rapid advance of our importations, you obſerve, " that, in a caſe of this nature, " where the progreſſion from one ſtate of things to " another is regularly accelerating as it goes along, " no adequate idea can be obtained by taking a mean " average of the whole. This information can only " be procured by comparing the rapidity of its progreſs " at different periods, in order that the ratio of its " increaſed velocity may be aſcertained. With this " view we divided theſe nine years (that is Mr. " Mackie's nine years, above-noticed, ending with " 1793) into three periods of three years each; and, " having ſtruck an average of the *actual* exceſs of im- " portation that took place during each of theſe pe- " riods, we found that its progreſs was regularly in- " creaſing with a rapidity even greater than that of " a geometrical ratio, as appears by the following table; " in the firſt column of which is put down the ave- " rage exceſs of importation as it actually took place " during the periods indicated; and, in the laſt co- " lumn, the firſt average is aſſumed as the loweſt " term in a ſeries increaſing in an exact geometrical " ratio.

" Average

	Quarters.	Quarters.
" Average-exceſs of importation,		
" in the years, 1785, 1786, and		
" 1787 - - - - - - - - - -	225,794	225,794
" Ditto, during the years 1788,		
" 1789, and 1790 - - - - -	304,873	451,588
" Ditto, during the years 1791,		
" 1792, and 1793 - - - -	1,095,555	903,176

" From this ſimple ſtatement we find, you ſay, that " the progreſs has been as regular nearly in the one " caſe as in the other, but that the *actual* augmentation " has exceeded the geometrical ratio by more than " 192,379 quarters in the laſt term. Hence we have " reaſon to conclude, that, in future periods, if no " circumſtances ſhall occur to interrupt this progreſs, " the deficiency will not amount to 36,893 quarters " only per annum, as Mr. H. has choſen to repreſent " it, but to conſiderably more than 1,265,015 quarters, " which was the actual deficiency experienced in the " year 1793."

Not to mention, that, of the three ſtatements of the average-exceſs of importations here given, the two firſt are erroneous to the amount of 30,000 quarters each, — that the principal exceſs, in every period, is in that of *oats*, — and that, during the laſt of the three, it exceeds 850,000 quarters, which yet could be ſcarcely ſufficient for the third part of the maintenance of Mr. Mackie's 400,000 increaſed number of horſes, — not, I ſay, to notice theſe *trifles*, the whole of your *ingenious* contrivance, independent of theſe circumſtances,

is *the baſeleſs fabric of a viſion*, which a ſingle ſtroke will cruſh to atoms, *and leave not a wreck behind.* For,

Permit me to adopt your argument, applying it to a prior period of equal extent, beginning with the year 1773, the very year when the dreadful law took place, which, in the opinion of Mr. Dirom, gave the death's wound to exportation, and fatally checked the progreſs of Britiſh agriculture; and I alſo divide it into three diſtinct æras of three years each, and the annual average-exceſs of imports and exports will ſtand as follows:

	Average-Exceſs of Imports.	Ditto of Exports.
	Quarters.	Quarters.
During the three years, 1773, 1774, and 1775 - - - - -	774,667	
Ditto, during the three years, 1776, 1777, and 1778 - - -	452,620	
During the three years, 1779, 1780, and 1781 - - - - - - - - - - -		79,568

In theſe ſtatements, we ſee that the *de*creaſe of importations is as regular and rapid as the *in*creaſe in *yours*; the *de*creaſe in my *ſecond* is more than four times greater than the *in*creaſe in *your* ſecond; and, in my *third* period, it is in the proportion of 452,620 quarters to 79,568 quarters leſs than nothing; a decline ſomething more, I preſume, than in that of *a geometrical ratio*, and *hence*, to apply your *curious* argument nearly in your own words, *we have reaſon to conclude*,

conclude, that, in future periods, if no circumſtances ſhall occur to interrupt this progreſs, our exportations will be incalculable!!!

This reaſoning, as far as my feeble ſhort ſight enables me to diſcern, would have been altogether as judicious in the year 1782 as it was in the year 1797, when urged by you; but, for the utter futility of it, I appeal to your own Table above given, where it appears, that, inſtead of an immenſe *exportation* having taken place, a ſtriking reverſe has happened, and the *exceſs of importations* has been prodigious. Can you, Gentlemen, aſſign any ſatisfactory cauſe why a ſimilar reverſe may not again occur in the courſe of the nine years, beginning with 1794 and ending with 1802? — Should we be bleſſed with a favourable ſucceſſion of ſeaſons, — ſhould our encloſures continue to increaſe, — and ſhould our land-proprietors have univerſally the wiſdom to give their tenants due encouragement, by never exacting rents too high, and by granting leaſes, fair, rational, and judicious, — I ſhould, for my own part, have no fear of it. But, to continue the application of your reaſoning, as purſued in your next paragraph: — "If," you ſay, "as Mr. H. contends, the "deficiency of grain, ſo regularly increaſing, is to be "*chiefly* attributed to the proportionate augmentation "of the numbers of our people, what an aſtoniſhing "idea does this give of the rapidity with which our "population is extending! — Dr. Franklin repreſents "the population of the American States as doubling "itſelf in 25 years, which is more than was known "to take place elſewhere; but, in Gaeat Britain, we

" have ſeen, that, according to Mr. H.'s argument, the " population is *doubled* every three years!!! — At this " rate, our little iſland muſt contain, in half a cen- " tury, more people than are at preſent on the globe. " But, where food will be procured to ſuſtain them, " it requires more ingenuity than we poſſeſs to diſ- " cover."

The argument you are here pleaſed to *father* upon me is not *mine* but *yours*; and I might, therefore, return the brat, without ceremony, to its only true and worthy parents: permit me, however, for once, to *adopt* it, and, by its aſſiſtance, haſten to relieve you from all painful anxiety how food is to be procured for that amazing multitude which is ſoon to people *this little iſland*. If you turn to the Table of Statements I have juſt above preſented, you will ſee what an aſtoniſhing idea is there ſuggeſted, not of the rapidity with which our population has been *extending*, but *contracting!* — In the three years beginning with 1773, our people were ſo numerous that, beſides our home-produce, they conſumed annually about 774,667 quarters of corn brought from abroad! and yet, in the very next three years, they were ſo diminiſhed that they did not eat ſo much by above 450,000 quarters; and, the three years immediately ſubſequent, they were reduced ſo much more and ſo much faſter that they not only could not conſume *all their own* produce, but ſent 79,568 quarters to feed their neighbours. What is Dr. Franklin's increaſe of population in the American States compared with this *decreaſe* of it in Great Britain! — And, had you made your calculations only

fifteen

fifteen years ago, I make no doubt you would have predicted that our populous nation would, in the courſe of half a century, have become a deſolate and uninhabited iſland!! — *Riſum teneatis amici.*

But, pleaſantry apart, I will now *ſeriouſly* endeavour to ſhew you that, even ſuppoſing your Table perfectly correct, and that I had really aſſerted that our increaſed importation of grain was not only *chiefly*, but *entirely*, occaſioned by our increaſed population, and that this latter always varied in exact proportion to the former, yet your reaſoning grounded thereupon would have been fundamentally erroneous; for, you have confounded the increaſe of *total population* with the increaſe of merely *additional population.* The firſt term, in your above Triennial Series, is 225,794; your ſecond, 451,588; and your third, 903,176; and you ſtate, that the *actual* increaſe of importation was greater ſtill, being really 1,095,555; "and, therefore, "according to *my reaſoning*, the population of Great "Britain muſt have been *doubled* every *three* years." Now, no ſuch concluſion would follow, unleſs I had alſo aſſerted that the total average-number of people in Great Britain, during the firſt three years, was only 225,794; in the ſecond, 451,588; in the third, 903,176; or, if you pleaſe, 1,095,555. But, this is ſo far from being the true ſtate of the caſe, that our people, even *prior* to the commencement of *your firſt* period, were, in all probability, nearly 10,000,000. Conſequently, inſtead of being *doubled* every *three* years, you will find, upon making the requiſite calculations, they would actually have been increaſed little more than one-*tenth*

even in *nine* years; an augmentation vaſtly leſs than that of Mancheſter, Liverpool, and Birmingham, and ſcarcely more than has taken place in my pariſh of Dunmow.

To adopt nearly your own language, page 405, I *might* here cloſe my remarks upon "your ſtrictures; "and, were I to take nothing into conſideration but "*yourſelves*, they *ſhould* here be cloſed; but, when I "conſider the importance of the ſubject, as reſpect-"ing the community at large, and the benefits that "may be derived from forming juſt ideas of it, or the "hurt that may accrue from erroneous notions at the "preſent time;" when foreign foes and domeſtic enemies are plotting our deſtruction; and when I alſo remember that you have ſent your numerous *perverſions* of my meaning into every quarter of the kingdom, and that few will have the candour or the leiſure to detect your miſrepreſentations, which, undetected, might widely diffuſe gloom and deſpondence; I ſhall hope to be pardoned for making a few additional obſervations.

You ſay, page 405, that the county-reports to the Board of Agriculture inform us, that the *greateſt* part of the lands in *England* and *Wales* are occupied by tenants-*at-will*, who may be ejected at ſix months notice, if the landlord ſhall ſo pleaſe. This (as it appears to me) is, to ſay the leaſt of it, extremely defective and erroneous. I have read a large proportion of the Reports, and I readily confeſs I have learned no ſuch thing. Without conſulting them, indeed, it is well known that mere tenants-*at-will*, occupying farms,

farms, are liable to ejection on ſix months notice; but, then, I conceive this ſix months notice is only valid when given immediately prior to the cuſtomary termination of the year. However, it is quite unneceſſary to be ſolicitous about this diſtinction. The only queſtions of importance are, do theſe tenures comprehend the *greateſt part* of the lands in England and Wales? and, are they *now*, or have they *recently* been, *increaſing?* — Both theſe queſtions may, I preſume, be ſafely anſwered in the negative.

With regard to the firſt queſtion, *Are the greateſt part of the lands in England and Wales occupied by tenants-at-will?* — It ſtrikes me that the reverſe is highly probable. A very conſiderable number of farms in moſt pariſhes are occupied by their own immediate proprietors; many are holden on *college-leaſes*; many are rented on *common leaſes, for a certain term of years, from hoſpitals and other corporate bodies*; and, as to other eſtates, whether copyhold or free, as far as my own perſonal obſervation has extended, I may ſafely venture to ſay, that at leaſt half of them, whether belonging to the nobility or to common gentlemen, are let upon leaſes of ſix, nine, twelve, fifteen, or twenty-one, years, proportionable, in ſome meaſure, to the ſize, or other circumſtances, of each particular farm reſpectively. This I conceive to be nearly the caſe in this county; and how the matter ſtands in others I believe I may ſafely refer the reader for ſatisfaction to the ſame ſource of information to which you yourſelves appeal, — *the Agricultural Reports.*

But, granting the proportion of theſe tenures-*at-will* to be really what you repreſent, and that they are *univerſally* and without *exception* obſtructions to the progreſs of agriculture, (which I would, however, by no means allow,) yet the grand and moſt important queſtions are ſtill behind. Have theſe tenures been *recently* increaſed? are they *now* increaſing? and, are they likely to increaſe for the *future?* — If this be not the caſe, your argument fails fundamentally; they are no *new* diſcouragements of improved cultivation. But here, again, the fact, I believe, is juſt the reverſe. There appears ſtrong probability that theſe tenures have been long diminiſhed, are ſtill diminiſhing, and are likely to continue to diminiſh. You know, that, within the laſt forty years, almoſt three millions of acres have been encloſed; and that leaſes of conſiderable duration, though not ſo generally as might be wiſhed, yet not unfrequently, have accompanied thoſe encloſures.

I will, however, readily acknowledge that, in ſome of the mountainous parts of North Wales, and a few other particular diſtricts of different quarters of the kingdom, this pernicious practice has not only prevailed time immemorial, but is rather increaſing; but, even *there*, agriculture does not appear to be going backwards, but rather advancing, however ſlowly: nay, even *in Caernarvonſhire*, one of the moſt northern of the Welch counties, we find that Lord Penryhn has ſet a noble example of granting leaſes, and his eſtates have thence doubled their value, and the tenants, mean time,

time, have not leſs increaſed in wealth and proſperity.

But, even ſuppoſing no *advancement*, but even a retrograde motion, to have taken place in theſe ſmall inconſiderable places, what are they to the *greateſt part* of *England* and *Wales?* — Read the Agricultural Reports again, Gentlemen; it may help a little to diſpel your vapouriſh apprehenſions. You will there ſee not only that leaſes are almoſt univerſally recommended, and judicious improvements of them ſuggeſted, but moſt pleaſing accounts that thoſe ſuggeſted improvements have been happily adopted. Peruſe Mr. Kent's Report of the County of Norfolk, the ſoil of which, though naturally poor, has become, from leaſes, encloſures, &c. one of the moſt agricultural and moſt improved counties in the kingdom, having often increaſed the value of eſtates in the proportion of from five to twenty, and, as Mr. K. expreſſes it, "they are "ſtill increaſing like ſnow-balls."

I have juſt obſerved, that, within the laſt forty years, almoſt three millions of acres have been encloſed, and that the encloſures have been accompanied by leaſes. I will now add, that the joint conſequence has been, that the produce of ſuch lands, whether arable, meadow, or paſture, each being applied to the uſe beſt ſuited to its nature, has been *doubled*, *trebled*, *quadrupled*, and even increaſed *ten fold*. I beſeech you, quit your lofty manſions, enveloped in the ſmoke and fogs of London, and breathe, for awhile, the pure clear country-air. Travel around the kingdom; croſs it from end to end, from corner to corner, from ſide

to

to ſide, from Penzance to Berwick-upon-Tweed, from Lynn to Liverpool, and from Dover to Cardigan; where will you find the cultivation of the ſoil, the improvement of the meadows and paſtures, retrograde or even ſtationary, and not, by far the greater part, advancing with rapid ſtrides? — Go into the county of Somerſet; viſit the Mendip-Hills; you will there find above 13,000 acres recently encloſed, and that the encloſures have augmented the produce ten to one. The crops of oats have been from forty to ſixty buſhels an acre, where little or nothing was ever grown before. Survey the moors and marſhes, and lower grounds, and you will behold improvements not inferior, though of a different kind. 17,400 acres, within the laſt twenty years, have been encloſed in Brent-Marſh; and, having been alſo drained and cleared of their ſuperfluous ſtagnant waters, they are rendered ſo extremely productive as to enhance the value above £200,000. A moiety of the manor of Wedmoor, twenty years ago, might have been purchaſed for £20,000; now it is worth more than £160,000; and others, in the vicinity, have received ſimilar augmentation of value. Sedgemore-Drainage, comprehending, I think, about 20,000 acres, has raiſed its rents from 1s. per acre to 30s. and advanced its worth from a mere trifle to £500,000. Indeed it is difficult to ſay, whether, in this county, one of the largeſt in England, the improvements of paſtures, meadows, and marſhes, or the cultivation and increaſed produce of grain, have made the moſt rapid progreſſion. Point out, Gentlemen, ſimilar inſtances of the contrary, of the abſolute

decline

decline of the one or the other, whether the lands be holden with or without leaſes; produce your maps, and ſtate your meaſurements; give your one thouſands and twenty thouſands of acres of arable and paſture, of meadow, marſh, and moor, where, from want of leaſes, from injudicious reſtrictions in them, from drawing *tithes in kind*, or any other cauſe, a plentiful abundant produce has dwindled to almoſt nothing; you will *then* deſerve attention; but, *till* then, ſilence will be your wiſeſt and moſt prudent meaſure.

To tithes in kind, to withholding leaſes, or to injudicious reſtrictions in them*, I am, perhaps, as little a friend as yourſelves; though, with regard to the former, and in certain circumſtances, they are of little importance. At the ſame time, however, I freely acknowledge, that I have known particular inſtances in which they have each, to individual perſons, been highly injurious and oppreſſive. But what is this to your general purpoſe? — Your argument goes, at leaſt *ſhould*

* Though I cannot but think that leaſes are highly expedient, where expenſive improvements are to be made, yet I muſt acknowledge that I could point out inſtances of noblemen who lay it down as an indiſpenſable maxim never to grant leaſes, and who yet treat their tenants with ſuch generous kind indulgence that the farmers all around are eager to live under them. Nay, what is ſtill more directly in point, I well remember a farmer in Kent who conſtantly farmed without a leaſe, and preferred the doing ſo, who yet ventured upon the moſt ſpirited and expenſive improvements, and, in the courſe of about thirty years, from an inconſiderable original, acquired a fortune of nearly £25,000; yet, even this very induſtrious, ingenious, and fortunate, man, I believe, ſaw reaſon, before his death, to change his opinion reſpecting the propriety and advantage of leaſes upon judicious and encouraging terms.

go,

go, on a larger ſcale, and have a more extenſive application. The queſtion is not what inconvenience or injury *one in a hundred* has incurred, but what has been the caſe of the *ninety-and-nine*; not what has been the *partial*, but *general*, operation. In this view, the evils complained of, I hope and believe, are not increaſing, but gradually diminiſhing; and will, doubtleſs, be more and more ſo as men grow wiſer and become more and more ſenſible of their trueſt intereſt. At preſent, however, I will ſay no more on theſe ſubjects; becauſe, I ſhall ſoon have occaſion again to bring them before your awful tribunal in another ſhape and more ample ſize, and where I am morally certain they will meet your dreadful and deciſive reprobation.

Quitting this ſpecies of reaſoning, to evince the decline of our agriculture and the decreaſe of our corn-productions, you proceed, page 407, to an argument of ſomewhat different deſcription, deduced from aſſertions of mine totally miſunderſtood or wilfully perverted. I had ſaid, page 8 of my pamphlet, that the advance of *rents*, *rates*, *tithes*, *and taxes*, had not been equivalent to the advance in the price of corn and other agricultural produce. In confirmation of this, I appealed to the increaſing proſperity of our farmers, during the laſt forty years, compared with what it was the forty years before: that, prior to 1750, they had been perpetually breaking and ſinking into poverty; that, ſince that period, they had been as gradually riſing in wealth and proſperity: that, from an original of a £1,000 or £1,500, they had purchaſed eſ-

tates

tates of from £50 to £200 a year, and *conſiderably more*. Theſe laſt words, *now* in italics, though of great importance, you have *conveniently* choſen to paſs over, and only remark, that, from this fact thus ſtated, it is evident that I think it indicates a very *unuſual* degree of proſperity indeed, if, in the line of agriculture, a man, who ſets out with a capital of from £1,000 to £1,500, ſhall be able to purchaſe, during the courſe of his life, from £50 to £200 a year. This remark of yours is partly *true* and partly *falſe*, and the application of it is *totally* wrong. It is true, that the proſperity here ſtated is, with reſpect to this immediate neighbourhood to which the aſſertion was entirely confined, rather *unuſual*; it is unuſual, alſo, in the only ſenſe my argument required, namely, compared with what took place during the forty years before; but it is not ſo *unuſual* in the ſouthern parts of the county, eſpecially thoſe diſtricts *opprobriouſly* called the *hundreds*, where agriculture has advanced much faſter than in the northern. There much greater things have certainly been done; and, in other counties, greater ſtill.

Your application, however, of what I ſaid, independent of the diſtinction now made, is altogether inappoſite. That the profits of farming are not ſo great as thoſe of ſome other kinds of buſineſs I am ready to admit; becauſe, it is really nothing to the purpoſe before us; the ſole queſtion being, not whether farmers grow rich ſo faſt as tradeſmen, manufacturers, and merchants, but whether they have not been more flouriſhing, and conſequently poſſeſſed greater encou-

ragement

ragement in general to exert themſelves, during the laſt forty years, than during the forty years immediately before: and this fact I conſider as certain, and ſhall continue to do ſo, till I ſee better reaſons for the contrary than you have yet condeſcended to advance. Long may they enjoy their proſperity, and long may it increaſe more and more!

But that it can ever equal that which ſometimes takes place in other profeſſions and employments is highly improbable, and for this obvious reaſon, — the land-proprietor will always, from time to time, take the benefit ariſing from improved cultivation. *That* farmer alone who cultivates his own eſtate can ever hope to equal thoſe engaged in other departments of buſineſs; nor can even *he* expect to accumulate ſo vaſt a fortune as is incidentally obtained by merchants and bankers, by dealers in the ſtocks, by contractors for fleets and armies, by government-agents, nabobs, and Eaſt-India directors, or even, perhaps, by *you*, Gentlemen, Monthly Reviewers, whoſe *honourable efforts* ſeem ſometimes directed to make *black white* and *white black*.* But, if their gains be leſs, and their advancement ſlower, they are generally more ſafe and ſecure. If they be not to-day poſſeſſed of princely wealth and opulence, they are not to-morrow plunged in the gulphs of ruin and perdition.

But, with regard to the ordinary run of common trades, common buſineſſes, and profeſſions, I can by no means fully accede to your repreſentations concern-

* Were it not invidious, I could eaſily produce numerous inſtances in confirmation of this.

ing

ing them. In moſt of theſe, you aſſert, "that a man "would be deemed unfortunate if he did not realize, "before his death, above four times £200 a year," that is, above £20,000; "and that it would not be "noticed as extraordinary if his gains amounted to "forty times that ſum," that is, if I underſtand it, £8,000 a year, or £240,000: "nay, that the writer "of this article could ſpecify a greater number of his "acquaintance than I have done who began buſineſs "with leſs than £100, and who are now worth from "£10,000 to £20,000 a year," that is, at the loweſt eſtimate, £500,000 ſterling; "and ſome, who began "the world with nothing, who are worth more than "double that ſum," or a round million, "and all "this *in fair open* buſineſs!!!" — I rejoice, Gentlemen, that, for *once*, you are not diſpoſed to *depreſs* the condition of your countrymen: but for us, poor country-people, we can only ſtare and wonder that ſuch ſtrange things are done at London! — We can boaſt no ſuch opulent acquaintance. We look round about us, for twenty, thirty, or forty, miles, to our lawyers and attorneys, our phyſicians, ſurgeons, and apothecaries, our manufacturers, our grocers, drapers, tanners, butchers, curriers, millers, bakers, and we ſee ſome of them ſinking into poverty; others, by conſtant perſevering induſtry, ſtrict and regular economy, gaining a decent ſubſiſtence for themſelves and families, and even ſetting them out in the world in rank and ſtation ſimilar to their own; and ſome few (one in twenty, perhaps) acquiring genteel moderate fortunes to retire upon, and paſs the evening of their days

days in eaſe, tranquillity, and comfort. What fools they are thus to bury themſelves in the country, in comparative indigence, and not run in troops to town, where wealth and ſplendour are ſo eaſily obtained!

What follows in the two next paragraphs, pages 408–9, is, if poſſible, more extraordinary than any thing hitherto noticed. I had ſaid, page 33, that it was evident that the culture of grain had been more attended to than either grazing or dairying, from this circumſtance, that the average-price of our beef and pork, butter and cheeſe, had increaſed more than the price of our corn; and your remark upon it is, "that this "was nearly as if I had ſaid that the beſt way of "encouraging the production of an article is to di-"miniſh the price." Were you really awake, Gentlemen, when you uttered this? — It is ſo much like the reveries of a dream, that I am inclined to think you muſt, all the while, have been moſt comfortably *napping*. You ſeem to have confounded *paſt* events with motives reſpecting *futurity*. Butter and cheeſe, beef, mutton, and pork, have hitherto borne a higher average-price than corn. Why? — Becauſe they have been produced in leſs proportionable abundance. — Is not this an inducement to pay greater attention to them for the future? And will not this, in time, reſtore the equilibrium?

But, you aſk, am I not aware that our *corn*-markets may be ſupplied by the produce of other countries, but that our fleſh-markets muſt be ſupplied by our farmers alone? — Indeed, Gentlemen, I am not aware of this latter circumſtance. Are not beef and pork,

pork, butter and cheeſe, imported from Ireland, Holland, &c.? — And, the more of thoſe that are imported, will not the leſs be neceſſary to be raiſed at home; the fewer ſheep to be fed; the fewer oxen to be fattened; the fewer cows to be dairied; the more acres to be left for the culture of grain?

BUTCHERS' MEAT THE STAFF OF LIFE.

You farther contend, "that butchers' meat, and not "bread, as formerly, may *now* be conſidered as the "*ſtaff* of life by perſons of every deſcription in *Eng*-"*land*, and that *few* have adverted to the conſequen-"ces of this change in the diet of our people." — *Few*, indeed, I believe; and where even *you*, with all your ſingular ſagacity, have made the diſcovery of this *new ſtaff of life*, I cannot conceive. Once more, Gentlemen, let me adviſe you to quit your ſmoaky reſidence, and make a pleaſant excurſion to at leaſt thirty or forty miles around the capital, and inquire, as you go, in every town, village, and pariſh. You will find, indeed, that the gentlemen, the opulent traders and manufacturers, the large and wealthy farmers, from increaſed luxurious living, do indeed conſume more of butchers' meat than formerly, but that the poor agricultural labourers, comprehending above half the entire population, do not eat a third part ſo much as they did fifty years ago. A large proportion of them cannot purchaſe even *cheeſe*, but live on *bare* bread; while, not unfrequently, in their cottages at leaſt, with

 their

their wives and children, their drink is ſmall tea or cold water.

POTATOES.

You next inform us, pages 409–10, that, from data furniſhed by the ingenious Mr. Mackie, " you have " calculated that five fertile acres of grazing land will " be required to ſuſtain one man who lives on butch- " ers' meat for one year.

" That the ſame five acres of land, if cropped with " wheat, would ſuſtain twelve men and one half for " one year; and that, if cropped with potatoes, would " ſuſtain ſeventy-ſeven men and a half!!!"

You obſerve, that, " from this plain ſtatement, it " will appear very obvious that, however profitable it " may be for the farmer and the landlord to convert " corn-ground into paſture, it muſt prove highly de- " trimental to the public, when the mode of finding " ſubſiſtence for a given number of people, from a given " extent of land, is the object in view."

The accuracy of the above computation I do not ſuſpect, nor am I inclined to diſpute the inference deduced from it, ſuppoſing the ſole object in view be the finding ſubſiſtence for a given number of people from a given extent of land; for, any ſchool-boy might convince us of this. But the application of it to the preſent ſtate of this kingdom entirely fails. The *ſole object* in view is by no means the finding ſubſiſtence for a given number of people from a given extent of land, but to ſupply the wants and anſwer the demands of ſociety, in its preſent refined and highly-advanced

ſituation,

ſituation, with all its different ranks, ſtations, profeſſions, employments, manufactures, habits, taſtes, manners, cuſtoms, luxuries, &c. Suppoſe you plant all your land with potatoes, would a people thus infinitely diverſified be perſuaded to live upon them but from abſolute and dire neceſſity? — For a moment, however, grant that they would; what would become of your ſheep and oxen? what of your horſes? what of your trades and manufactures? — Where would be your fleeces and hides? — Where ſhould we have clothes to our backs and ſhoes to our feet? — What would betide our tanners and curriers, our combers and ſpinners and weavers, our drapers and tailors, &c.? All muſt be turned adrift, and run naked together in the fields, feeding upon potatoes, like hogs in a ſty. This ſtate, however, would not long continue: we ſhould ſoon be either ſlaughtered by foreign invaders, aſſerting the *rights* of man, or become their *hewers of wood and drawers of water*.

THE WISDOM OF THE COMMON-COUNCIL OF LONDON AND THAT OF THE MONTHLY REVIEWERS DIRECTLY OPPOSITE.

About ten or twelve years ago, the Common-Council of London diſcovered, by the exertion of wonderful wiſdom, that our *encloſures* had converted our paſtures into corn-fields, inſomuch, that we could get neither *beef* nor *mutton*. *You*, on the contrary, with equal ſagacity, have found out that our *corn-fields* are turned into *paſtures*, and we ſhall ſoon have no *bread*. It

 is,

is, however, ſome conſolation to us, under this dreadful apprehended calamity, that *bread* is become, in a manner, *unneceſſary*, you having alſo happily *found out* that butchers' *meat* may now *be conſidered as the ſtaff of life by perſons of every deſcription in England.*

CURIOUS SPECULATIVE PROOFS OF THE DECLINE OF OUR CORN-CULTURE.

Not content with endeavouring to ſhew, from imaginary facts, and curious reaſoning upon them, that our culture of corn has been greatly neglected, and grazing more attended to, you attempt to evince, by a ſingular diſplay of your ſkill in rural economy, that, in the nature of things, it neceſſarily *muſt* be ſo. As your ſtatements are a curioſity, I will give them here *verbatim*, and make a few remarks to illuſtrate their excellence.

You obſerve, page 402, " that a riſe of rents is ſo " far from being an evidence of improved agriculture " that it may have been the conſequence, in ſome caſes, " of a diminution of agricultural produce.

" Let us, for example," you ſay, " take an arable farm, " of good corn-land, of 100 acres. Of theſe, we ſhall " ſay that 60 acres are under crop, 15 under fallow " or green-hoed crops, which do not make any return, " and 25 under graſs for cows neceſſary for the fa- " mily, and for hay for the horſes on the farm. Let " us farther ſuppoſe, that the 60 acres under corn af- " ford an average-produce of three quarters and a half " per acre, making, in all, 210 quarters, which, if

" valued

" valued at 40*s.* per quarter on an average of all " kinds of corn, would amount to £430, the total " value of the produce of the farm, excluſive of graſs " and hay. Let us now try to aſcertain what rent the " farmer will be able to give for this farm.

" From the general produce muſt be deducted, in " the firſt place, for corn-*tithe*, 21 quarters; for ſeed, " at 3 buſhels per acre, 22 quarters, 4 buſhels; for " horſe-corn, ſay, 1 peck per day, for 6 months only. " This, for 8 horſes, will be 2 buſhels per day, or " 365 buſhels in all, which are 45 quarters and 5 " (ſay 4) buſhels. Theſe items, added together, make " 89 quarters, which, deducted from 210, leave 121 " quarters to be ſold, amounting, at 40*s.* per quar- " ter, to £242.

" From this ſum muſt be deducted, for 4 men- " ſervants, at £20 each, for wages and mainte- " nance - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	£80
" One maid-ſervant - - - - - - - - -	16
" Wear and tear of 8 horſes' ſhoeing, harneſs, " and labouring utenſils, at only £5 each - -	40
" Extra labourers in harveſt - - - - - - -	20
" In all - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	156
" Which, deducted from the net amount of " ſales - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	242
" Leaves a balance of only - - - - - - -	86

" The utmoſt rent, therefore, that could poſſibly be " drawn from this farm, under theſe circumſtances, " could not exceed £40, leaving the tenant worſe than " his labourer."

After going thus far, Gentlemen, I wonder you did not go one ſtep farther, and ſeriouſly ſet yourſelves to perſuade all the land-proprietors in the kingdom to give away their *corn-farms* to their tenants, or to whomſoever would vouchſafe to accept them; for, after a few more *inevitable deductions*, your *good corn-farm*, inſtead of bringing £40 yearly rent, would really not be worth a ſingle farthing.

But to proceed to your reaſoning upon it. " In re- " flecting," you ſay, " on the means of bettering his " circumſtances, under ſuch a ſevere preſſure, the te- " nant would ſoon perceive that, if he could free him- " ſelf from the *tithe*, he would obtain a clear bene- " fit of £42; that, if he diſencumbered himſelf from " his ſervants, *horſes*, *labourers*, and *implements of agri-* " *culture*, he would, at once, make a ſaving of £156 " more; in all, £198. All this he perceives he could " do merely by turning his land from tillage into graſs; " for, in this caſe, the tithe of graſs will be a tri- " fle, one ſervant will ſuffer inſtead of ſix or eight, " and his horſes will become entirely unneceſſary. — " By this mode of reaſoning, he finds, that, though " the value of the produce of his farm, when con- " verted into graſs, ſhould be diminiſhed from £420 " to £250, he will now be better able to pay £60 " rent than he was formerly able to pay £40. The " rent of land, therefore, may increaſe, under certain " circumſtances,

" circumſtances, while the general agricultural produce " of the country is greatly diminiſhed."

Suppoſing the above eſtimates to be judicious and correct, the concluſion here deduced is indeed clear and irreſiſtible; but general conjectural eſtimates, unleſs made by perſons of niceſt ſkill, are, for the moſt part, extremely fallacious. But, of all the eſtimates I ever ſaw, theſe are ſurely the moſt extraordinary; and, as they ſeem to have been produced as a ſpecimen of your ſuperior judgement, I ſhall pay to each my moſt reſpectful civilities.

With regard to the *agricultural* one, were you really ſerious when you made it? — Few of your readers, of competent knowledge, will, I preſume, at the ſlighteſt glance of it, be able to preſerve any tolerable gravity and compoſure of muſcles. The commoneſt farmer, of only ordinary ſkill in his buſineſs, though he might have the good manners not to laugh in your *face*, would certainly laugh in his *ſleeve*, and heartily wiſh that his landlord might believe the ſtatements correct, well knowing that he could afford to give *double* the rent you have mentioned, be rather *better off than his labourer*, and even put ſomething in his pocket beſides. Methinks it is pity, Gentlemen, that you are not appointed to fix the rents of all the *corn-farms* in the kingdom, as nothing, I conceive, would tend more directly to increaſe the cultivation of grain; nor do I ſee any evil likely to reſult from it, unleſs it be that the *Common-Council of London* would again complain that our meadows and paſtures were turning

into corn-fields, and *you* might lament that your *new ſtaff of life* was *failing* you.

But, to do adequate honour to your ingenious production, I muſt not confine myſelf to theſe general commendations, but deſcend to a little minuteneſs of detail, by which its merit will be rendered exceedingly conſpicuous and ſtriking!

In the firſt place, then, you tell us, that *green-hoed crops* make no return! Now, this I cannot but view with high admiration! — By *green-hoed crops*, I ſuppoſe, you mean, as, I believe, is generally meant, *tares*,* *turnips*, *clover*, *cole-ſeed*, &c. Now, to be informed that theſe are *worth nothing* was ſo oppoſite to my ſimple preconceptions, that I ſtood amazed at the novelty and depth of your diſcovery! — I had been previouſly told, that *tares*, after feeding bullocks a month or ſix weeks in the ſpring, have ſometimes produced a ſecond crop worth £10 an acre; cole-ſeed, a greater ſum; turnips, ten guineas; and that each, reſpectively, upon an average of ſeven years, was worth from 50*s.* to £3: and, with reſpect to *clover*, after ſix weeks ſpring-feed, I could myſelf point out an inſtance of ten acres which, the year before laſt, yielded 82½ buſhels of ſeed, which were ſold for 2½ guineas per buſhel, amounting, after a deduction of 5*s.* a buſhel for the threſhing, to upwards of £18 an acre net profit, excluſive of the ſpring-feed; and the crop of wheat which followed was but ſo much the better. This, indeed, was an extraordinary inſtance; but, in the common and ordinary courſe of things, an acre of clover, whether fed or ſeeded, or mowed twice for hay, if the land be good

* Tares and Clover, indeed, are ſeldom if ever ſeed: but that alters not the meaning

good and the ſoil ſuitable, may, I am told, be fairly ſet upon a medium at £3 or £4 an acre. After this intelligence from others, confirmed often by my own obſervations, I was, I confeſs, rather ſurpriſed to find that this was all a deluſion, and that theſe *green-hoed crops* make no *returns*. But let us proceed to another article no leſs curious and wonderful. For,

Here are, ſecondly, 25 *acres under graſs*. Now, in my humble conception, the food ariſing from the clover and tares, from the clover-hay, and other fodder, very little of the paſture and meadow produce will be wanted for the horſes; and there will be enough left for a dairy of at leaſt ſix or ſeven cows, the produce of which, moderately eſtimated, would be worth nearly £50. But all theſe make no return: ſix or eight perſons in the family eat up the whole; the butter and the cheeſe; the ſows, pigs, hogs, and calves; with farmer and all!!! But, to go on,

Thirdly, to the *horſes*. The number of theſe you ſtate to be eight. Of theſe, I muſt beg leave to ſtrike off two: ſix only are neceſſary, and even theſe will be idle great part of the year, there being only 15 acres fallow, and all the corn allowed by you to be ſent to market they might carry thither in leſs than a month. As they lead but an idle kind of life, during a conſiderable proportion of the winter, inſtead of giving them 5½ quarters a piece, the prudent farmer would give them little more than half that quantity. Suppoſe, however, that the ſix horſes conſumed 20 quarters in all, (a full allowance,) and we conſequently reduce what you propoſed to give 25½ quarters; and

I muſt here alſo obviate another ſtill more pleaſant miſtake you ſeem to have made. As, upon a different occaſion, you ſuppoſed *men* and *women* to live upon proviſions common to *hogs*, *horſes*, and *dogs*, ſo here you give your horſes the food peculiar to human creatures. You eſtimate your horſe-corn at 40*s.* a quarter, which certainly implies that the greater part of it muſt be *wheat*, 40*s.* being vaſtly above the medium-price of other grains per quarter: now, as I am for the good *old* mode of feeding horſes chiefly upon *oats*, I will only give you 17*s.* a quarter, which is 6*d.* above their average-price during the 20 years ending with 1793; I muſt, therefore, reduce your £90 for horſe-corn to £17: this gets rid of £73, which, added to the produce of the ſeveral articles above-ſpecified, cannot amount to leſs than £120, and, together with the £40 you allow for rent, make the whole £160. Out of this, all other expenſes being evidently ſuppoſed to be diſcharged, he may ſurely afford to pay a rent of even £80 a year, allowing your eſtimate of the produce and price of corn to be juſt, live rather better than his labourers, and have ſomething handſome to ſpare as a proviſion for his children.

There are ſome other of your eſtimated expenſes from which I might fairly make deductions; however, for the preſent, I paſs them over; and haſten to give you joy, that you put ſo much confidence in your own wiſdom as to run counter to the general opinion, reſpecting the due proportion between the annual value of the produce of a farm conſiſting of three parts

arable

arable and one paſture and meadow, the preciſe deſcription of that you have here adduced, and the annual rent which may be fairly given for it. It is, I believe, a pretty general idea, founded upon much obſervation and extenſive experience, that, if the farmer pays, as rent, even a fifth of the joint productions of ſuch farm, even in the preſent increaſed expenſe of cultivation, of tithes, poor's rates, &c. his ſituation is really advantageous and profitable, on an average of fifteen or twenty years. Now, the productions of *your* farm are £430, and yet you allowed only £40 for rent, which is not even a tenth part, and you leave your farmer a mere beggar, worſe than his labourers. On this I make no comment, but leave it to your own conſideration and that of the public.

Having thus paid my reſpects to your agricultural eſtimate, I will now take a curſory view of your grazing or paſture farm. Now, the utmoſt of the advantage you allow your paſture-farmer is, that he would be better able to pay a rent of £60 than he was able to pay £40 for his corn-farm, and even this goes upon the ſuppoſition that he pays a mere trifle for *tithe:* but you will permit me to obſerve, that, if the land be of the quality you repreſent, and the paſture and meadow be applied to the beſt and moſt advantageous purpoſes for the farmer, the *tithe* is worth, at leaſt, 4*s.* or 5*s.* an acre, and the aggregate amount will, of courſe, be from £20 to £25, which, being deducted from your £60 rent, leaves, at moſt, according to your own calculations, a rent of only £40. Such is the final reſult of your computations; ſuch the evidence of your diſtinguiſhed ſkill in rural economy;

and

and ſuch the ſatisfactory proof, *a priori*, that, moſt probably, much of our arable land muſt have been converted into paſture!

I muſt not, however, even yet, entirely quit the ſubjects before us; I particularly mean the value and profitableneſs of *corn-farms*, and the utility of *green* crops, in the moſt *ſtrict* and *literal* ſenſe of the word, that is, when they are not ſeeded, as in the inſtances above-repreſented, for the melioration and improvement of the ſoil. For a full and ſtrong illuſtration of this, give me leave to preſent you with an account of an arable *corn-farm*, from the Reports to the Board of Agriculture, upon which you ſeem to lay ſuch conſiderable ſtreſs. It is taken from Mr. Maxwell's General View of the Agriculture of the County of Huntingdon, drawn up for the Board, and is not founded upon vague conjectural eſtimates, but on well-authenticated facts. It is given upon thirty acres of the ſame individual land, for ſeven years, in immediate uninterrupted ſucceſſion, beginning with the year 1786, and ſtands as follows.

" 1786. Clean ploughing without dung; cole-ſeed; an
" ordinary crop. Sheep fed.
" 1787. Barley. One buſhel and a half per acre ſowed;
" no dung; produce, 6 quarters per acre.
" 1788. Clover. No dung; mowed twice; an enor-
" mous crop.
" 1789. Beans. 3½ buſhels per acre; ſheep fed; no
" dung; produce, 7 quarters per acre.

" 1790.

" 1790. Barley. One buſhel and a half per acre; no
" dung; produce, a little above 6 quarters.
" 1791. Clean deep ploughing; dunged, and cole-ſeed;
" ſheep fed; wonderfully ſtrong.
" 1792. Barley. One buſhel and a half per acre; pro-
" duce, 5 quarters per acre; clover, in a
" great meaſure, deſtroyed."

The writer obſerves, that, after this courſe, the land was worth, at leaſt, 5*s.* an acre more than it was at the beginning. How different theſe *facts* from your *gueſſes!* — If you will pleaſe to make the requiſite computations, and only allow two tons of clover-hay, at £3 a ton, in the year 1788, (a moderate allowance, moſt ſurely, for two *enormous* crops; probably, one-third below the fact,) 20 buſhels an acre for the *cole-ſeed*, in the years 1786 and 1791, at 40*s.* a quarter, (if ſeeded, and nothing appears to the contrary,) and only 25*s.* a quarter for the *beans* and *barley*, you will find the value of the annual average-produce per acre above £6 10*s.* and, if we even ſuppoſe the cole-ſeed was not ſeeded, but merely ſheep fed, upwards of £5, excluſive of the ſheep-feed and the ſaving of ſeed; — whereas *your* produce amounts to only about £4 6*s.* It is, at the ſame time, extremely obvious, that the ſkilful judicious farmer might greatly increaſe the produce of the above farm by introducing a ſtill greater variety of valuable crops, of which you will ſee, I hope, ſome ſtriking inſtances in my Report of the Agriculture of Eſſex.

From the above facts, and reaſonings upon them, it is pretty evident that well-managed arable land is

better

better than paſture, and that there is ſeldom any powerful inducement, with a view to profit, to convert the former into the latter. Is not a garden preferable to a paſture or a meadow of equal dimenſions? And what is a richly-manured and highly-cultivated farm but a garden of larger extent? — The hop-grounds of Farnham yield a rent of £9 or £10 a year per acre, though charged with a *tithe* of more than £3. Where are the paſtures of equivalent value? — And yet, a good arable *corn-farm*, after allowing for the different expenſes of culture, is, perhaps, as profitable to the *mere farmer*, on an average of twenty years, as the generality of hop-plantations. We need not, however, fear the continued proſperity of any of them, provided the land-proprietor underſtands his true intereſt, and is diſpoſed to give his tenants the proper encouragement. Paſture, meadow, garden, arable, all, in the preſent ſituation of things, reſpectively claim attention; and all, according to the varying wants and demands of ſociety, will mutually tend to their proper level.

Towards the concluſion of your ſtrictures, you intimate your having "ſuppreſſed the *greater* part of my "abſurd paſſages; becauſe, the ſelection of them would "tend merely to cheriſh a ſplenetic humour, without "anſwering any good purpoſe." If you meant it would have cheriſhed a ſplenetic humour in *yourſelves*, the ſuppreſſion was *prudent*; but, if in *me*, you were greatly deceived, and have alſo beſtowed your compaſſionate lenity upon a perſon who does not thank you for it.

Pretending,

Pretending, as you do, that *general utility* was your *ſole object*, is it not truly ſurpriſing you ſhould have obtruded upon the public more than twelve pages of perfect inſignificance, except to abuſe *me*, and *deceive* your readers? — And is it leſs wonderful that, of the *extravagances* you charged me with having heaped upon each other without probability or proof, you ſhould not have produced even *one?*

To do you juſtice, however, though what you *have ſaid* is altogether uſeleſs to any valuable purpoſe, what you have *not* ſaid may, perhaps, prove of ſome importance, it affording a ſatisfactory confirmation of the very *general* remark, that *ſometimes* no judgement can be formed either of the *merit* of a work, or even of its full purpoſe and deſign, from your account of it. The Appendix to my pamphlet, though making nearly a third part of the whole, and containing, at leaſt in my own conception, and in that of ſome others,* uſeful obſervations upon a ſubject of conſiderable moment, you have, as far as I can find, ſaid not a ſyllable; and how, therefore, the reader is to judge of the purpoſe and deſign of the whole publication, is beyond my comprehenſion.

The entire liſt of your accuſations againſt me, Gentlemen, is of no inconſiderable length. You charge me with " *a precipitancy ſeverely cenſurable, with ha-*
" *ving indulged a bias that has perverted my judge-*
" *ment, with an inconſiſtency characterizing the whole*
" *of my pamphlet, with diſguiſing facts, with intentional*

* See Critical Review for laſt October or November; I do not, at preſent, recollect which.

" *deception,*

" *deception, with falſe quotation, with petulance, and with* " *arrogance.*" How far theſe charges are well founded, or whether they be moſt applicable to me or yourſelves, I leave to the deciſion of the reader, from a careful and candid peruſal of the preceding pages. After all, to crown the whole, you have the *modeſt* aſſurance to tell me, that *you bear me no ill will, nor mean any thing derogatory to my moral character. Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.*

There are ſome other things in your ſtrictures, of which I have reaſon to complain. I ſhall not, however, trouble the reader with particular notice of them, what I have already ſaid being, I conceive, amply ſufficient to vindicate myſelf againſt your unhandſome treatment, to give additional illuſtration to ſome of the moſt important poſitions in my pamphlet, and to evince your utter incompetence to the work you undertook.

If, in the courſe of the preceding pages, I ſhould be thought, in my turn, to have indulged an unbecoming degree of ſarcaſtic ſeverity, the candid reader will readily ſuggeſt an apology, when he remembers how extremely difficult it is to reſtrain the emotions of contemptuous indignation at *ſuperficiality* and *ignorance* aſſuming airs of *deep penetration* and *dictatorial wiſdom.*

I now, Gentlemen, probably take my final leave of you. If, indeed, in your review of any future publication of mine, you ſhould happen to advance any thing of real moment, I ſhall be ready to avail myſelf of, and return my acknowledgements for, it;

but

but if, on the contrary, (which I deem by much the moſt likely,) it ſhould contain only miſrepreſentation and frivolous cavilling, I ſhall certainly be ſilent.

I remain, Gentlemen,

With all proper regard,

Your very humble ſervant,

Dunmow,
March 20, 1798.

JOHN HOWLETT.

By the ſame Author,

4 OC 58

And ſold by W. J. and J. RICHARDSON, Royal Exchange.

I. Examination of Dr. Price's Eſſay on the Population of England and Wales, &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*

II. Eſſay on the Population of Ireland, 1*s.*

III. Inquiry concerning the Influence of Encloſures upon Population, 2*s.*

IV. Confirmation, a Sermon, 1*s.*

V. Encloſures a Cauſe of Improved Agriculture, 2*s.*

VI. Inſufficiency of the Cauſes commonly aſſigned for the Increaſe of the Poor and Poor's Rates, &c. and the true One ſtated, &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*

VII. Examination of Mr. Pitt's Speech for the better Relief of the Poor, &c. 1*s.*

VIII. Diſperſion of the Gloomy Apprehenſions deduced from the Decline of our Corn-Trade, &c. 1*s.* 6*d.*